



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BACON'S CLAIM AND SHAKESPEARE'S "AYE."

THE following article by Mr. Hugh Black was received some weeks ago from Kincardine, Ontario. It attaches an entirely new meaning to the famous epitaph of Stratford. Mindful of the motto, *Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur*—and for the benefit of "Baconians," whose theories have recently found so able a champion in our contributor, the Hon. Ignatius Donnelly—Mr. Black's article is here published, with some interesting comments by Mr. Edward Gordon Clark. It is hardly necessary to restate the fact that the editor of this REVIEW is not responsible for the opinions of its contributors, nor to add that he holds himself guiltless of any wish to dethrone the King of Literature.



ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

"FRA BA WRT EAR AY."*

IF Lord Bacon wrote the plays that have come down to us under the name of Shakespeare, it was his duty to leave to posterity the means of ascertaining the truth. A secret writing such as Ignatius Donnelly has found in the plays would be one way. Another way might be an epitaph, containing an inner writing, placed on Shakespeare's grave. And the key to the cipher might be made known afterwards. An inscription such as this would seem well suited to the purpose he would have in view. In this inscription he might insist that the grave be not disturbed, and that the stone, with the epitaph on it, be preserved intact. Such a device would possess the quality of permanency in a high degree. It would keep the secret securely till the time for its revelation should arrive. Taking into account the place and the circumstances, a statement conveyed in this way would deserve to be regarded as the most solemn affirmation it was possible for the writer to make. The purpose of this article is to show that Lord

* This title is Mr Black's.—EDITOR.

Bacon did make such an epitaph. The epitaph, which all students of Shakespeare will remember, is as follows :

GOOD FRENDE FOR JESUS SAKE FORBEARE
TO DIGG T-E DUST ENCLOASED HE.RE.
BLESE BE T-E MAN  SPARES T-ES STONES
AND CURST BE HE  MOVES MY BONES.

I have copied it, preserving the distinction of large and small letters, as I find it in Knight's Edition of Shakspeare's Works. Charles Knight thinks it was not written by Shakespeare. He says :

"It is very remarkable, we think, that this plain freestone does not bear the name of Shakespere—has nothing to establish the fact that the stone originally belonged to his grave. We apprehend that during the period that elapsed between his death and the setting-up of the monument a stone was temporarily placed over the grave ; and that the warning not to touch the bones was the stone-mason's invention, to secure their reverence till a fitting monument should be prepared, if the stone were not ready in his yard to serve for any grave. We quite agree with Mr. De Quincey that this doggerel attributed to Shakespere is 'equally below his intellect, no less than his scholarship,' and we hold with him that 'as a sort of *siste viator* appeal to future sextons, it is worthy of the grave-digger or the parish clerk, who was probably its author.'"

On one point at least De Quincey and Charles Knight are certainly in error. If we take the group of large capital letters near the end of the first and second lines of the epitaph, and arrange them in the proper order, we get all the letters of the name "Shakespeare" except two, enough to establish the fact that the stone was prepared purposely for his grave. And further, the epitaph could not have been made by any local poetizer ; for while there was a great variety of ways of spelling the name in Stratford, in no single instance does the letter E occur in the first syllable. Neither could Shakespeare himself have been the author, for a similar reason.

The seeming eccentricities of three of the words of the epitaph are thus accounted for. But there are other peculiarities, of spelling and of large and small capitals, that are not explained. And this brings me to the discovery I have made. It occurred to me, as the epitaph consists of two kinds of letters only, large and small, that Lord Bacon's *omnia per omnia* cipher, described in the *De Augmentis*, might be the key to the secret. "For this

cipher is practicable in all things that are capable of two differences." That the reader may be able intelligently to follow the explanation, I will now quote from the *De Augmentis*, published seven years after Shakespeare's death, the essential part of what Lord Bacon there says on the subject of ciphers, including the key to the cipher used in the epitaph.

"There is a new and useful invention to elude the examination of a cipher, viz., to have two alphabets, the one of significant and the other of non-significant letters; and folding up two writings together, the one conveying the secret, whilst the other is such as the writer might probably send without danger. In case of a strict examination about the cipher, the bearer is to produce the non-significant alphabet for the true, and the true for the non-significant; by which means the examiner would fall upon the outward writing, and finding it probable, suspect nothing of the inner.

"But to prevent all suspicion, we shall here annex a cipher of our own, that we devised at Paris in our youth, and which has the highest perfection of a cipher—that of signifying *omnia per omnia* (anything by everything), provided only the matter included be five times less than that which includes it, without any other condition or limitation. The invention is this: first, let all the letters of the alphabet be resolved into two only, by repetition and transposition; for a transposition of two letters through five places, or different arrangements, will denote two and thirty differences, and consequently fewer, or four and twenty, the number of letters in our alphabet, as in the following example:

A BILITERAL ALPHABET

consisting only of *A* and *B* changed through five places, so as to represent all the letters of the common alphabet.

A = aaaaa	I = abaaa	R = baaaa
B = aaaab	K = abaab	S = baaab
C = aaaba	L = ababa	T = baaba
D = aaabb	M = ababb	V = baabb
E = aabaa	N = abbaa	W = babaa
F = aabab	O = abbab	X = babab
G = aabba	P = abbb a	Y = babba
H = aabbb	Q = abbbb	Z = babbb

"Thus, in order to write *A*, you write five *a*'s or *aaaaa*; and to write *B*, you write four *a*'s and one *b*, or *aaaab*; and so of the rest.

"Let there be also at hand two other common alphabets, as for example, Roman and italic. All the letters of the Roman are read or deciphered, by translating them into the letter *A* only. And all the letters of the Italic alphabet are to be read by translating them into the letter *B* only. Now adjust or fit any external double-faced writing, letter by letter, to the internal writing, first made biliterate; and afterwards write it down for the letter or epistle to be sent."

It will be observed that Lord Bacon speaks of Roman and italic letters, but large and small letters will do equally well. I now repeat the epitaph, placing the letters in twenty-two groups of five letters each, translating the large capitals into *B*, and the small capitals into *A*. The dash is reckoned a small letter, be-

cause it stands for H. The combination $\frac{T}{Y}$ is reckoned as a single large letter, because the T is placed exactly over the Y.

baaab aaaaa aabaa aabbb baaaa
 aaaab aaaaa babba aabaa aabaa abbb
 baaaa aabab baaba aaaaa babab aaaaa
 baaaa aaaaa babaa aaaaa baaaa

Two things will be noticed that give evidence of design : first, there are no letters left over ; second, the combinations are all significant, that is, they all stand for letters in Bacon's biliteral alphabet, although the number of possible combinations is thirty-two, and the number used in the alphabet only twenty-four. Referring to the alphabet, the twenty-two groups are found to stand for the following twenty-two letters :

S	A	E	H	R	
B	A	Y	E	E	P
R	F	T	A	X	A
R	A	W	A	R	

Above and to the right of the line I have drawn are the letters forming the word "Shaxpeare," spelled this time with an X. The thirteen letters below and to the left form suggestive parts of five other words, "*Fra Ba wrt ear ay*," which, being completed, read, "*Francis Bacon wrote Shakespeare's Plays*." Whilst the letters are arranged promiscuously, it will be seen that there is a certain order followed, beginning at the bottom left-hand corner, and ending at the upper right-hand corner. This seems to indicate that the word "Shaxpeare" is to be read last, and is intended as a signature.

It is now clear that this epitaph was written by Bacon ; for a cipher is used that was devised by him, and this cipher was not published until long after the plain freestone had been placed over Shakespeare's grave.

It remains only to indicate what seems to have been Shakespeare's part in the affair of the epitaph. It is not at all likely that his family would have allowed such a piece of doggerel to be placed on his grave if they had not known that it was by his express command. Nor is it likely that Bacon would have caused it to be put there if he had not previously obtained Shakespeare's consent. And the fact that his name occurs in the inner writing,

seems to show that the cipher had been explained to him, and that he had consented to have his name put in it by way of signature.

The tradition that Shakespeare himself made the epitaph a little before his death, has probably this much foundation : That before his death he instructed the stonemason to prepare the gravestone, gave him the epitaph, and insisted that every letter be faithfully copied, preserving accurately the distinction between large and small letters. To help in securing accuracy, he very likely explained that the large letters near the end of the first two lines were intended for his own name. In doing so he would have been acting according to the plan recommended by Bacon in the first paragraph of my quotation from the *De Augmentis*. In the epitaph, then, it would appear that we have the solemn affirmation, not of Bacon only, but of Shakespeare also, that Francis Bacon was the author of Shakespeare's Plays.

HUGH BLACK.

"BAKON, SHAXPERE—WE."

MR. CLARK'S DISCOVERIES.

COMPLYING with the request of the editor of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, I have very carefully examined the contribution from Mr. Hugh Black, and will state the results. But they are so unexpected and startling that no one but myself must be held accountable for my conclusions.

Mr. Black claims that he has discovered the application of Francis Bacon's biliteral cipher to William Shakespeare's epitaph. There can be no doubt that Mr. Black's paper, entitled "Fra Ba Wrt Ear Ay," justifies the claim. Any one who will look at Bacon's "Advancement of Learning" (the translation in Bohn's Philosophical Library) will find, from page 221 to page 225, all the quotations that Mr. Black has made. Bacon explains also, with perfect precision, the working of the cipher. Mr. Black has followed his directions implicitly.

The Shakespeare epitaph is correctly reproduced by Mr. Black—every letter, every point of punctuation. The epitaph is rarely printed in modern editions of Shakespeare, and is sometimes incorrect even in the editions of Knight. For instance, in "The Stratford Shakespeare," published by Appleton & Co., 1874 Vol. 1, page 159, I find this :

GOOD FRIEND FOR JESUS SAKE FORBEARE
TO DIGG T-E DUST ENCLOSED HEARE :
BLESTE BE $\frac{F}{Y}$ MAN $\frac{T}{Y}$ SPARES THESE STONES,
AND CURST BE HE $\frac{T}{Y}$ MOVES MY BONES.

But, on appeal to "Snake-sneare's Complete Works," Knight's Biographical volume, page 542 (London : Virtue & Co.), the epitaph is found in print as Mr. Knight says it was put on the tombstone, and as Mr. Black has transcribed it.

Mr. Black calls attention to the monstrous peculiarities of this piece of "doggerel," but insists, against Mr. Knight, that it must have been designed for Shakespeare's grave, and no other. Again, Mr. Black is undoubtedly correct. He points to the words "SAKE" and "HE .RE." in the first and second lines, as containing nearly all the letters in Shakespeare's name. But suppose we glance at "SAKE" in the first line, and then at SPARES, immediately under it in the third line. Then only H and E are missing from the name, and these two letters are fairly thrown at the eye from all parts of the epitaph.

S(H)AKE SP(E)ARES, T-Es Stones ; T-E Dust ; T-E Man.—It is an eye pretty nearly blind that is unable to see a very strange and artful purpose here. But just in this queer way of saying "Shake-speare," lies Bacon's "non-significant alphabet," as he termed it, which hides the "true one," yet in itself looks like a cipher "by which means the examiner would fall upon the outward writing, and, finding it probable, suspect nothing of the inner." The spurious cipher here—the one that "gives itself away" as soon as a cipher is thought of at all—and was undoubtedly meant to do so—is the plain fact that the epitaph is loaded with the name of Shakespeare, without directly uttering it.

But now let us follow Mr. Black with the "inner," the "true," the "significant" cipher. Any one can easily verify him at every step.

I took the epitaph, as Bacon directs, and divided it into segments, so that each segment was "a combination of five letters." In these segments, I then followed Mr. Black in reducing the whole epitaph to a and b. *a* would naturally be used for all the small letters, and *b* for the large ones; as, otherwise, the biliteral alphabet—capable of thirty-two combinations—would give eight possible letters not used as English signs of sound. Moreover, any one constructing a sentence to hold a cipher would avoid suspicion by using as few large, or in any way peculiar letters, as the writing would permit. The first segment of the epitaph is | Good F|, or baaab.

But here I repeat a little of Mr. Black's work, for the reason that I have made some additions to it. He treats the hyphen which forms the "H" in "T-E" as a small letter. It is both small and large. Alone, it is small enough, but, in conjunction with the "T" and the "E," it is certainly a full capital. The result is this :

	S baaab	A aaaaa	E aabaa	H aabbb	R baaaa
B aaaab	A aaaaa	Y babba bbbaa	E aabaa	E aabaa	P abbaa
		Q			
R baaaa	F aabab aabbb	T baaba	A aaaaa	X babab bbbab	A aaaaa
	H			Z	
	R baaaa	A aaaaa	W babaa	A aaaaa	R baaaa

This is Mr. Black's diagram of Bacon's "significants :"

S	A	E	H	R
B	A	Y	E	E
R	F	T	A	X
R	A	W	A	R

The extra letters, obtained by reading the Hyphen (with its limits) as a capital letter, are H Z Q.

It should be said that the names of Shakespeare and Bacon would, by the very nature of the case, be at once anticipated and sought by any one discovering the connection between Bacon's cipher in *De Augmentis* and Shakespeare's tombstone. It was inevitable, therefore, that Mr. Black should place the letters of this anagram about as he did, and should read them thus :

FRA BA WRT EAR AY.
SHAXPEARE.

But it will be found that the assertion, " Francis Bacon wrote Shake-speare's Playes," is not derivable from these " significant's." That assertion is just now " in the air," or, rather, it is in the mind of every " Baconian," and it appears to have taken Mr. Black away from the actual interpretation. Let us *stick to Bacon*, his rules and his facts.

It is necessary to mention, at this point, that I find the Shakespeare epitaph to consist of a methodical series of anagrams, composed of such " significant's" as Mr. Black exhibits in the figure he has drawn. On falling into order, each of these anagrams gives a brief statement in regard to Francis Bacon, William Shakespeare, or both. The anagrams are exact, and cannot be made to work except as the author intended. But they are compressed and abbreviated, and they are phonetic. No attention is paid to spelling. The struggle is to express the sense. As I read the first one, it stands thus :

FRA BA WRYT EAR. A, A !—SHAXPERE.

" Writ" is an old form of the indicative past frequently used by Shakespeare, and I place the two A's as solemn affirmations. The anagram might be read :

FRA BA WRT EAR. AYA !—SHAXPERE.

This would in no wise change the sense ; but that the surplus A's stand for iteration and exclamation I have reason to judge from what will follow. Remembering that we are at work with Lord Bacon—*his* cipher, *his* key—the phonetic sentence easily translates itself into this :

FRANCIS BACON WROTE HERE : AYE, AYE !
SHAXPERE.

Of course the sentence might be inverted, to read

SHAXPERE WROTE HERE : AYE, AYE !
FRA BA.

But that would really make no difference ; for another application of the cipher, as I shall show, affirms that Bacon " obeyed Shaxpere" in " narrating" the epitaph.

But now let us take the three letters—" significant's" they are indeed—which are derived from reading the hyphens of the epitaph as capitals. Two of these letters, Q and Z, depend on reading their " significant's" inversely, just as we invert the effect of the hyphen in finding them. The third letter, H, is simply what the hyphen forms, in its direct outward use, whether large or small. The three " significant's" are H. Z. Q., or

HIS CUE.

So we have :

FRA BA WRYT EAR H Z. Q : A, A !,—
FRANCIS BACON WROTE HERE HIS CUE : AYE, AYE !

A subsidiary meaning is undoubtedly this : All the letters, H. Z. Q. (his cue), depend on the hyphen, and just this hyphen is the "cue" by which his cipher

fits the epitaph, and by which his *nom de plume* "Shake-speare" is related to Shaxpere.

But let us put all the "significants" together. The whole list is this :

A !—FRA BAQ WRYT HEAR AZ SHAXPERE.

AYE ! FRANCIS BACON "WRIT" HERE AS SHAXPERE.

The world is certainly indebted to Mr. Hugh Black for a most amazing discovery. Let us look further at the Shakespeare epitaph.

To a scholar, the most ridiculous thing in it—an utter abomination—is the separation, at the end of the second line, of the word "here" into two parts : thus, "HE.Re." Could anything else in all literature be in such bad form as this ? But in the light of Bacon's cipher, the abbreviated Latin particle, "Re," instantly suggests the command to return, to go backward, to try again. I so understood it, and applied the cipher, beginning at the last letter of the epitaph and ending with the first. It comes out thus :

B aaaab	A aaaaa	F aabab	A aaaaa	B aaaab	
A aaaaa	X { babab } Z { babbb }	A aaaaa	K abanb	W { babaa } H { bbbaa }	B aaaab
P abbba	E aabaa	E aabaa	O { abbab } Q { abbbb }	A aaaaa	R baaaa
B aaaab	H bbbaa	E aabaa	A aaaaa	S baaab	

The hyphen is again tabulated as both a large and small letter, and the second combination in the last line must be read backward.

The translation of the cipher in Mr. Black's way gives these letters as Bacon's significants:

B A F A B
A X A K W B
P E E O A R
B H E A S.

The upper line consists of Francis Bacon's initials ; or, rather, the letters F. BA, peculiarly repeated by the position of the F. The line may be allowed to stand by itself awhile.

The next glance shows that the name of SHAXPERE can be eliminated. The remaining letters below the line form the sounds, BACO, WE, BA. Adding the letters of the top line, we have, as the whole product, so far:

SHAXPERE, BACO, WE : F. BA, BA, BA, A.

It is plain that, if the letter N were in the anagram, it would have wonderful significance, containing, as it would, the full names, phonetically at least, of

both Shakespeare and Bacon. But wait: b and a are the constituents of the cipher itself. How do they form an N? Thus—abbaa. Take the superfluous letters from F. Ba, Ba, Ba, A, and we have just the required abbaa, or N.—leaving F. BA. So the epitaph reads:

BAKON,		SHAXPERE,
SHAXPERE,	or	BAKON,
WE.		WE.
F. BA.		F. BA.

If now, the hyphens of the Shakespeare epitaph are used as large, instead of small, letters,—as b's instead of a's,—we are confronted with the significant H H Z Q., or,

H HZ Q— H HIS CUE.

Once again: Letting the names Shaxpere and Bacon stand as they are, suppose we take all that is left. Then we have:

F B A W E H Z Q

Rearranged, the letters are:

F B Q W A Z H E— F. BQ. WAS HE.

Or the meaning of the significant, entire, is this:

SHAXPERE:

BAKON WAS HE.

F. BAQ.

The acute reader will, of course, observe that Bacon's "Re," in the word "HE.Re," has more than one application. The command, or hint, is many-sided, and appears to have special reference to the position of the particle in the epitaph. I tried the cipher next, beginning at the period in "HE.Re.," connecting with the right-hand end of the line above, then keeping on and around back to the period. This process gives:

R	A	Q	C	A	I
baaia	aaaaa	bbba	aaaba	aaaaa	abaaa
D	F	S	B	D	
bbaaa	aabab	baaab	aaaab	aaabb	
	aabbb				
	H				

R A Q C A I
D F S B D—or,

FRACS BAQ DID—FRANCIS BACON DID!

Here is a reiteration of the solemn "Aye!" previously found, and which I said I must regard as correct.

But here, too, I have followed Mr. Black, and used the hyphen in "T-E" as a small letter (a). In my list of significant, however, it is included as H (b). It changes the first result into

FRACS BAQ HIDD. (FRANCIS BACON HID.)

My fourth application of the cipher began, again, with the period in "HE.Re"—that is, with "E.," going back and around to the start. These are the bilateral

combinations and their alphabetic correspondents—omitting, at first, the doubly counted hyphen.

D bbaaa	R baaaa	S baaab	W babaa bbbaa H	D aaabb	
C aaaba	A aaaaa	I abaaa	Q abbbb	A aaaaa	B aaaab

DRSWDCAIQAB

BAQ RAISD DC. W.

BACON RAISED DECEASED WILLIAM.

I was puzzled, at first, to know whether Bacon meant he "raised" Shakespeare—say from his young manhood to his theatrical maturity—or whether, as we should say, he "elevated" William's "standing." I was soon informed; for, on reducing the first line of the epitaph backward, and the second line forward, to the cipher and its anagram, there came out of it the words :

BA AIDED, EQUIPPED.

I need not further display the biliteral reductions in detail, as any reader can obtain them for himself by going carefully over my ground.

I must mention here, to avoid the "smart" criticism of some sweet-minded wag, that the statement "BAQ RAISD DCW" is not the most direct reduction, which would be

BAQ RAISED CD (SEEDY) WILLIAM.

But "Fra Baq"—that terrific dealer in double meanings, phonetic and other—has anticipated the charge of such post-mortem levity. The hyphen as a large letter (H)—not used at first in any of my results—has no application, this time, that I can see, except to drop faintly between D and C, and determine the word as "deceased."

I must now mention another striking peculiarity of the Shakespeare epitaph, and state a finding I have made in connection with it. The "T" in each of the last two lines stands for a large letter in the epitaph as a whole, and counts for b in the biliteral alphabet. Mr. Black has so used it, and rightly. But Bacon gave it a double use. * $\frac{T}{2}$ is at once a large letter (double size) and *four small ones*. Turned on its side the T makes an H; the foot of it crosses the v-part of the Y, making A; and the lower part of the Y, crossed by its base, makes a second T. The $\frac{T}{2}$ is thus literally "*that*" in *one large letter*. So it can be used as five biliteral signs—one large letter and four small ones. This gives eight new counters for the biliteral alphabet—all a's in their several combinations. They are used with great effect in the last two lines of the epitaph, where they stand in conjunction with the "Re" of the second line; for thus the combinations of five, constituting the biliteral alphabet, come out even. "Fra Baq" has made good use of these extras. Now, keeping them in mind, biliteralize the epitaph, beginning at "Re," taking the third and fourth lines backward. Then join the end of the third

* See the epitaph. The regular type here does not quite express the matter.—E. G. C.

line with the beginning of the fourth, and go to the end of it. The significants of the third and fourth lines alone are:

R F I C A M D
Q A R R C B A

Those of the fourth line and its connecting B are :

D A L A A R.

The first anagram delayed and annoyed me greatly. The initials F. B. were there, and the inevitable "Q." The bunch of R's necessitated some such word as "robbery" or "bribery," but neither would answer. Finally I eliminated "F. B." and his "Q.;" put the letters R A D I C A together, merely because I was stuck there, and threw down the rest in disgust. These strange "significants" suddenly shaped themselves as

M B R A C R,

and the story was told. "Embracery" is the old legal term for judicial corruption, and Lord Bacon has come down in history as an "Embracor." The whole statement is

EMBRACER Q: F. B. R A D I C A L.

EMBRACER CUE: F. BACON RADICAL.

Bacon was "radical" enough, in politics, religion, and science. Besides, he instantly corroborates himself. The significants, D A L A A R, already given, constitute

A L A D A R.

The three lines (*belonging together, remember*) become

M B R A C E R Q: F B A. R A D I C A L A D A A R.

Bacon gives two reasons *in one* why he was charged with "Embracery!" He was "radical" and a (court) "ladder" (for some one else to climb on). Hence, in those packed "significants," he makes one "L" do for the end of "radica(l)" and the beginning of "(l)adder." The "Embracery" (bribery) cue is that Francis Bacon was "radical" and a "ladder."

I will give three more reductions from this wonderful epitaph.

Begin with "Re." and read to the end of the lines. The product is:

W B N R A L }
R I A L A A R } H. P.

Two legitimate readings come out of this anagram :

BA WIL NARRA HPR LA (Lays)
and
BA WIL NARRA HR PLA (Plays).

After we get well along in the use of his cipher, Bacon uses "H P R" for the hyphenated "Shake-speare;" but at this point he has been giving me information in regard to "Shakespeare" in general, whom he explains as a symbol, in "iambic-idyllic heroics," of Henry of Navarre; declaring, as I understand him, that "Henry Laq" (Lackland, I suppose) was produced by order of Elizabeth. To

"narrate" is the old form of saying "to put in story," and "lay" is an obsolescent word for almost anything in the way of metrical composition. I am not sure but even the Shakespeare sonnets are filled with some cipher; but I think Bacon means that he will inject a story into the Henry Plays. The most direct possible phonetics generally express him. Here the double sound may declare a double significance. I can tell later. But, relying on my Lord Bacon himself, I am perfectly confident that the forthcoming work of Ignatius Donnelly is anything but a hoax.

If Bacon's biliteral alphabet, according to the explanations I have now made, be applied to the whole Shakespeare epitaph, counting the period in "HE. Re" as a small letter, the result is

BA WIL NARRA AL SHAPERE HEAR BY Q
OR
BA WIL NARRA AL SHAQPERE HEAR.—
BACON WILL NARRATE ALL SHAKESPEARE HERE.

"Fra Baq" has already told me about "Shaqpere," in pronouncing upon his origin and the derivation of his name. But my space is limited.

I must explain one thing more, however. Mr. Black reminds us that Shakespeare's epitaph has always been called "doggerel." It is such. But *that* is in what Bacon would call the "non-significant" aspect. In the inner, the "significant" aspect, I suspect it will turn out to be the most marvelous stanza of writing ever composed on earth. Nothing is in it without a purpose. In putting on the whole pressure of his cipher, Bacon finally uses even the period at the end of "Re(.)" as well as the one in "HE(.)Re." This connects the whole epitaph into such a number of combinations (fives) that the first two lines can be used with the second two when the T's are counted as five letters each.* Fit the cipher to the four lines connected in this way, and what was probably intended for the concluding anagram of the Epitaph is this:

S baaab	A aaaaa	E aabaa	H aabbb	A baaaa	B aaaab
A aaaaa	Y babba	E aabaa	E aabaa	O abbab	
	Q bbbaa				
E aabaa	B aaaab	N abbaa	R baaaa	A aaaaa	L ababa
		H bbbaa			R baaaa
I abaaa	A aaaaa	L ababa	A aaaaa	A aaaaa	R baaaa
			P abbba		

S A E H A B
A Y E E O Q
E B N R A L
H R I A L A A R P.

SHAQ PERE ALL NARA HERE: A! I OBEY.

BA.

JACQUES PIERRE IS ALL NARRATED HERE: AYE!

I OBEY (HIS WISHES).

BACON.

* He also uses the period at the end of the last line, and with marvelous results.—
E. G. C.

As these comments on Mr. Hugh Black's wonderful discovery will be apt to bring a little thunder and lightning about my own head, I must be pardoned for saying that I have never been a "Baconian," nor do I care much who wrote the Shakespeare plays. Not that I am indifferent to justice of any kind—even musty and moldy historic justice. But I have in hand what, to me, are moral and practical interests of so much greater moment, that I had taken but little interest in the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy until Mr. Black's paper was put into my hands, that I might deal with it professionally, as an impartial literary expert. I have taken out of the Shakespeare epitaph what I have found in it; and have ascertained that Francis Bacon fitted that epitaph to his "*Omnia per Omnia* Cipher." No head on the globe, that holds any conception of cause and effect, can long doubt Mr. Black's claim in that regard. There is no use of talking about "happy coincidences," or stopping to consider any other like nonsense. The geologic epoch of the earth, to say nothing of the historic epoch, is not long enough to produce two such "coincidences" as we find here by the score. In this piece of accidental work I have already gathered so much material that I am tempted to announce, for the immediate future, "The Anagrammatic Biography of William Shakspere: By Francis Bacon." It has lain unpublished some two hundred and seventy years. But there is no great difficulty in bringing it out.

EDWARD GORDON CLARK.